JS 44 (Rev. 09/19) Case 2:20-cv-11454-SJM-ACIVIC COVER FIRST 15-75/20 Page ID.1 Page 1 of 15 The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as required by law of court. This form approved by the Indical Conference of the United States in Sentember 1974 is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the

provided by local rules of court purpose of initiating the civil do	. This form, approved by the cocket sheet. (SEE INSTRUC	he Judicial Conference of TIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF	the Unit	ted States in September 1 RM.)	1974, is requi	red for the use of	the Clerk of Co	urt for th	ie	
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS Shelly Haddock and John Haddock				DEFENDANTS Zimmer US, Inc., Zimmer Biomet Holdings, Inc., Zimmer Biomet, Inc., and Zimmer Surgical, Inc.						
(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Wayne County (EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)				County of Residence		ed Defendant _	Indiana			
				NOTE: IN LAND CO THE TRACT		<i>LAINTIFF CASES C</i> ON CASES, USE TI IVOLVED.		OF		
Iv áf) L.শুলুমুণ্ড উত্তল্যস্থ্ৰ ^{me, Address, and Telephone Number) Law Offices of Ivan L. Land, P.C. 25900 Greenfield Rd., Suite 210 Oak Park, MI 48237 248.968.4545}				Attorneys (If Known)						
II. BASIS OF JURISDI	CTION (Place an "X" in C	ne Box Only)		TIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPA	L PARTIES	(Place an "X" in and One Box fo	One Box for Or Defendo	or Plainti <u>f</u> ant)	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff				P	TF DEF €1 □ 1	Incorporated or Pr of Business In T	incipal Place	PTF	DEF	
☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant	■ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)		Citize	en of Another State	2 🗇 2	Incorporated and I of Business In A		5	9 5	
			Citizen or Subject of a							
IV. NATURE OF SUIT			I EC	ORFEITURE/PENALTY		here for: Nature of KRUPTCY		STATUT		
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	PERSONAL INJURY 310 Airplane 315 Airplane Product Liability 320 Assault, Libel & Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 355 Motor Vehicle 360 Other Personal Injury Medical Malpractice CIVIL RIGHTS 440 Other Civil Rights 441 Voting 442 Employment 443 Housing/ Accommodations 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other 448 Education	PERSONAL INJURY 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability 367 Health Care/ Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERT 370 Other Fraud 371 Truth in Lending 380 Other Personal Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage 385 Property Damage 536 Other Personal Product Liability PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: 463 Alien Detainee 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence 530 General 535 Death Penalty Other: 540 Mandamus & Other 550 Civil Rights 555 Prison Condition 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement	71	EABOR Description of Property 21 USC 881 Other LABOR Fair Labor Standards Act Labor/Management Relations Railway Labor Act Family and Medical Leave Act Other Labor Litigation Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION Naturalization Application Other Immigration Conter Immigration Conter Immigration Conter Immigration Conter Immigration	422 Appe	al 28 USC 158 drawal SC 157 RTY RIGHTS rights t t - Abbreviated Drug Application mark SECURITY (1395ff) t Lung (923) C/DIWW (405(g)) Title XVI 405(g)) LAL TAX SUITS (U.S. Plaintiff efendant)	375 False Cl: 376 Qui Tam 3729(a) 400 State Re 410 Antitrus: 430 Banks an 450 Commer 460 Deportat 470 Racketed Corrupt 480 Consum (15 USC 485 Telephon Protecti 490 Cable/Sc 850 Securitie Exchang 890 Other State 891 Agriculti 893 Environn 895 Freedom Act 896 Arbitrati 899 Adminis	aims Act in (31 USC) apportion t and Banking cce tion er Influence Organizati er Credit er Credit cc 1681 or 1 ne Consum on Act at TV es/Commod ge atutory Act ural Acts mental Ma a of Inform fon trative Prop Decision tionality of	ment g ced and ions 1692) ner ditties/ tions atters nation	
Proceeding Star	noved from 3 te Court Cite the U.S. Sivil Sta	Remanded from Appellate Court	Reop	(specify)	r District	☐ 6 Multidistr Litigation Transfer		Multidist Litigation Direct Fil	n -	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTIO	Prief description of ca	o implant		1000000						
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:			DI	OEMAND \$ CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint: JURY DEMAND: Yes ONO						
VIII. RELATED CASE IF ANY	(See instructions):	JUDGE			DOCKE	T NUMBER				
DATE June 4, 2020	. (SIGNATURE OF ATTO	DRNEY O	FRECORD						
FOR OFFICE USE ONLY RECEIPT # AM	10UNT	APPLYING IFP		JUDGE		MAG. JUD	GE			

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN SOUTHERN DIVISION

SHELLY HADDOCK and JOHN HADDOCK,

Plaintiffs,

V

ZIMMER US, INC., ZIMMER BIOMET HOLDINGS, INC., f/k/a/ ZIMMER HOLDINGS, INC., ZIMMER BIOMET, INC., f/k/a ZIMMER, INC., and ZIMMER SURGICAL, INC.

Defendants.

Ivan L. Land (P65879)

Law Offices of Ivan L. Land, P.C.

Attorney for Plaintiffs
25900 Greenfield Rd., Suite 210
Oak Park, MI 48237-1267
(248) 968-4545 / (f) (248) 968-4540
ill4law@aol.com

COMPLAINT AND JURY DEMAND

NOW COMES Plaintiffs, SHELLY HADDOCK and JOHN HADDOCK, by and through their attorneys, the Law Offices of Ivan L. Land, P.C., and states as follows for their Complaint:

NATURE OF THE ACTION

This is an action for damages relating to Defendants' development, testing, assembling, manufacturing, packaging, labeling, preparing, distribution, marketing, supplying, and/or selling of the Zimmer device.

PARTIES, JURISDICTIONAL ALLEGATIONS

- 1. Plaintiff, SHELLY HADDOCK (hereinafter "HADDOCK"), is a resident of Wayne County, MI.
- 2. Plaintiff, JOHN HADDOCK, is a resident of Wayne County, MI.
- 3. Defendant, ZIMMER US, INC., is a Delaware corporation and its principal place of business is located at 345 East Main Street, Warsaw, IN 46580, and was duly registered and/or licensed to do business in the State of Michigan.
- 4. Defendant, ZIMMER BIOMET HOLDINGS, INC., f/k/a/ ZIMMER HOLDINGS, INC., is a Delaware corporation and its principal place of business is located at 345 East Main Street, Warsaw, IN 46580, and was duly registered and/or licensed to do business in the State of Michigan.
- 5. Defendant, ZIMMER BIOMET, INC., f/k/a/ ZIMMER, INC., is a Delaware corporation and its principal place of business is located at 345 East Main Street, Warsaw, IN 46580, and was duly registered and/or licensed to do business in the State of Michigan.
- 6. Defendant, ZIMMER SURGICAL, INC., is a Delaware corporation and its principal place of business is located at 200 West Ohio Avenue, Dover, OH 44622, and was duly registered and/or licensed to do business in the State of Michigan.
- At all relevant times, each of the Defendants and their directors and officers acted within the scope of their authority of each Defendant and on behalf of each other Defendant.

 During the relevant times, Defendants possessed a unity of interest between themselves and Zimmer, and they exercised control over its subsidiaries and affiliates. As such, each Defendant is individually, and severally liable to the HADDOCKS for HADDOCKS' injuries, losses, and damages.

- 8. Zimmer Us, Inc., Zimmer Biomet Holdings, Inc., f/k/a Zimmer Holdings, Inc., Zimmer Biomet, Inc., f/k/a Zimmer, Inc., and Zimmer Surgical, Inc., will herein be collectively referred to as "ZIMMER."
- 9. The court has subject matter jurisdiction pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1332(a) because Plaintiffs and Defendants are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000 exclusive of interest and costs.
- 10. Venue is proper in the Eastern District of Michigan pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(a) and (c), as a substantial number of the events, actions or omissions giving rise to Plaintiffs' claims occurred in this District. At all times material hereto, Defendants conducted substantial business in the State of Michigan.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 11. In November of 2010, HADDOCK learned that she required a right hip replacement because her right hip was damaged by arthritis degeneration.
- 12. On December 14, 2010 at Oakwood Heritage Hospital, HADDOCK was surgically implanted with the *Stryker Rejuvenate* in her right hip.
- 13. In February of 2015, HADDOCK learned that she required a revision surgery because her surgically implanted *Stryker* hip was defective.
- 14. On March 31, 2015 at Oakwood Heritage Hospital, HADDOCK underwent hip revision surgery.

- 15. Upon information and belief, HADDOCK was implanted with the ZIMMER'S #15

 IMPLANT 225 Stem and Femoral Head (hereinafter "the IMPLANT") for the revision surgery that is the subject of this lawsuit.
- 16. Tragically, on June 9, 2017, the IMPLANT failed while HADDOCK was at work vacuuming a floor, she felt her right hip pop and she fell to the ground in excruciating pain.
- 17. HADDOCK was rushed to the hospital in an ambulance and it was discovered that the IMPLANT had failed.
- 18. HADDOCK later learned that her femur bone was fractured and the stem of the IMPLANT had failed as it broke causing HADDOCK'S injuries (See Exhibit 1).
- 19. On June 12, 2017, HADDOCK had revision surgery to repair her damaged hip.

COUNT I

(Negligence against ZIMMER)

- 20. HADDOCKS incorporate by reference the above paragraphs.
- 21. At all relevant times, it was the duty of ZIMMER to exercise due care in designing, testing, manufacturing, distributing, marketing, promoting, and selling of the IMPLANT such that it would be reasonably safe for its intended use.
- 22. ZIMMER breached their duty of reasonable care owed to HADDOCK by defectively designing, manufacturing, and/or negligently failing to warn of these defects in the IMPLANT thereby causing HADDOCK'S injuries and damages.
- 23. ZIMMER was negligent in the designing, testing, manufacturing, distributing, marketing, promoting, and selling of the IMPLANT and also in the following ways:

- a) ZIMMER, in advertising, marketing, promoting, packaging, and selling the IMPLANT, negligently misrepresented material facts regarding the IMPLANT safety, efficacy, and fitness for human use by claiming the IMPLANT was fit for its intended purpose when, in fact, it was not;
- b) ZIMMER, in advertising. marketing, promoting, packaging, and selling the IMPLANT, negligently misrepresented material facts regarding the IMPLANT safety, efficacy, and fitness for human use by claiming the IMPLANT had been adequately and reliably tested when, in fact, it was not;
- c) ZIMMER, in advertising, marketing, promoting, packaging, and selling the IMPLANT, negligently misrepresented material facts regarding the IMPLANT safety, efficacy, and fitness for human use by claiming the IMPLANT was safe and effective and was appropriate for use by human beings when, in fact, it was not; and
- d) ZIMMER, in advertising, marketing, promoting, packaging, and selling the IMPLANT, negligently misrepresented material facts regarding the IMPLANT safety, efficacy, and fitness for human use by claiming the risk of serious adverse events and/or effects from the IMPLANT'S was comparable to that of other hip replacement systems, when in fact it was not.
- 24. ZIMMER knew or had reason to know that HADDOCK, as a member of the general public for whose use the IMPLANT was placed into interstate commerce for, would be likely to use the IMPLANT in a manner described in this Complaint.
- 25. ZIMMER knew or reasonably should have known of the danger associated with the manner and circumstances of HADDOCK'S foreseeable use of the IMPLANT, which danger would not be obvious to the general public.

As a direct and proximate result of one or more of the forgoing wrongful acts or omissions by ZIMMER, HADDOCK was caused to suffer and sustain injuries of a permanent nature; to endure pain and suffering in body and mind; to expend money for medical care in the past and in the future; furthermore, HADDOCK was unable to and will in the future be unable to attend to her normal affairs and duties for an indefinite period of time.

COUNT II

(Breach of Express Warranty against ZIMMER)

- 27. HADDOCKS incorporate by reference the above paragraphs.
- HADDOCK currently is not in possession of any document relating to representations, 28. warnings, and/or communications made by ZIMMER in this action. HADDOCK reserves the right to present evidence in support of the claim which is not presently in her possession, but which will be discovered in the ordinary course of litigation. Such evidence may include, but is not necessarily limited to: Instruction for Use Manuals; all written material or information provided on and/or within any and all packaging associated with HADDOCK'S device; manufacturer's labels, package inserts; Adverse Event Reports; clinical trial data; medical literature; medical research findings and opinions; medical publications; advertisements, sales and promotional materials; internal memoranda, emails, communications and databases; sales, prescription and adverse event report databases; and communications from ZIMMER in this action, including ZIMMER's employees, officers, directors, agents, representatives, contractors and business associates, to the public, medical community, HADDOCK'S implanting surgeon and HADDOCK. Upon information, knowledge and belief, HADDOCK alleges that the documents, instruments and/or evidence stated above are in the possession of ZIMMER.

- 29. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, it knew that the hip device was intended for human use.
- 30. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, HADDOCK was a foreseeable user of the device.
- 31. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, it expressly warranted that the IMPLANT, including all of its component parts, was safe and merchantable for its intended use.
- 32. HADDOCK and her implanting surgeon reasonably relied upon the representations that the IMPLANT was of merchantable quality and safe for their intended uses.
- 33. HADDOCK used the IMPLANT for its intended purpose.
- 34. Contrary to the express, at the time ZIMMER marketed, sold and/or distributed the IMPLANT, it was not of merchantable quality or safe for their intended use as described above.
- 35. As a direct and proximate result of one or more of the forgoing wrongful acts or omissions by ZIMMER, HADDOCK was caused to suffer and sustain injuries of a permanent nature; to endure pain and suffering in body and mind; to expend money for medical care in the past and in the future; furthermore, HADDOCK was unable to and will in the future be unable to attend to her normal affairs and duties for an indefinite period of time.

COUNT III

(Breach of Implied Warranty of Merchantability against ZIMMER)

36. HADDOCKS incorporate by reference the above paragraphs.

- HADDOCK currently is not in possession of any document relating to representations, 37. warnings, and/or communications made by ZIMMER in this action. HADDOCK reserves the right to present evidence in support of the claim which is not presently in her possession, but which will be discovered in the ordinary course of litigation. Such evidence may include, but is not necessarily limited to: Instruction for Use Manuals; all written material or information provided on and/or within any and all packaging associated with HADDOCK'S device; manufacturer's labels, package inserts; Adverse Event Reports; clinical trial data; medical literature; medical research findings and opinions; medical publications; advertisements; sales and promotional materials; internal memoranda, emails, communications and databases; sales, prescription and adverse event report databases; and communications from ZIMMER in this action, including ZIMMER'S employees. officers, directors, agents, representatives, contractors and business associates, to the public, medical community, HADDOCK'S implanting surgeon and HADDOCK. Upon information, knowledge and belief, HADDOCK alleges the documents, instruments and/or evidence stated above are in the possession of ZIMMER.
- 38. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, it knew that the hip device was intended for human use.
- 39. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, HADDOCK was a foreseeable user of the device.
- 40. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, it impliedly warranted that the IMPLANT, including all of its component parts, was safe and merchantable for its intended use. ZIMMER warranted that the implanted IMPLANT was in good condition at a minimum:

- a) Would pass without objection in the trade under the contract description;
- b) Was fit for the ordinary purposes for which such goods are used;
- c) Would run, within the variations permitted by the agreement, of even kind, quality, and quantity within each unit and among all units involved; and/or,
- d) Conformed to the promises or affirmations of fact made on the container or label if any.
- 41. ZIMMER, when they sold the implanted IMPLANT, breached the foregoing implied warranty of merchantability.
- 42. HADDOCK and her implanting surgeon reasonably relied upon the representations that the IMPLANT was of merchantable quality and safe for their intended uses.
- 43. HADDOCK used the IMPLANT for its intended purpose.
- 44. Contrary to the implied warranties, at the time ZIMMER marketed, sold and/or distributed the IMPLANT, it was not of merchantable quality or safe for their intended use as described above,
- 45. As a direct and proximate result of one or more of the forgoing wrongful act or omissions by ZIMMER, HADDOCK was caused to suffer and sustain injuries of a permanent nature; to endure pain and suffering in body and mind; to expend money for medical care in the past and in the future; furthermore, HADDOCK was unable to and will in the future be unable to attend to her normal affairs and duties for an indefinite period of time.

COUNT IV

(Breach of Implied Warranty of Fitness For A Particular Purpose against ZIMMER)

- 46. HADDOCKS incorporate by reference the above paragraphs.
- 47. HADDOCK currently is not in possession of any document relating to representations, warnings, and/or communications made by ZIMMER in this action. HADDOCK reserves

the right to present evidence in support of the claim which is not presently in her possession, but which will be discovered in the ordinary course of litigation. Such evidence may include, but is not necessarily limited to: Instruction for Use Manuals; all written material or information provided on and/or within any and all packaging associated with HADDOCK'S device; manufacturer's labels, package inserts: Adverse Event Reports; clinical trial data; medical literature; medical research findings and opinions; medical publications; advertisements; sales and promotional materials; internal memoranda, emails, communications and databases; sales, prescription and adverse event report databases; and communications from ZIMMER in this action, including ZIMMER's employees, officers, directors, agents, representatives, contractors and business associates, to the public, medical community, HADDOCKS implanting surgeon and HADDOCK. Upon information, knowledge and belief, HADDOCK alleges the documents, instruments and/or evidence stated above are in the possession of ZIMMER.

- 48. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, it knew that the hip device was intended for human use.
- 49. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, HADDOCK was a foreseeable user of the device.
- 50. At the time ZIMMER marketed, sold, and/or distributed the IMPLANT, it impliedly warranted that the IMPLANT, including all of its component parts, was fit for the particular purpose for which the implanted IMPLANT was intended.
- 51. HADDOCK, the hospital and implanting surgeon relied upon ZIMMERS' skill and/or judgment in its ability to furnish a device for the particular purpose for which the implanted IMPLANT was intended.

- 52. The implanted IMPLANT that ZIMMER sold to hospitals, doctors and HADDOCK were not fit for their particular purpose and ZIMMER breached their implied warranty of fitness for particular purpose to the hospitals, doctors and HADDOCK.
- 53. As a direct and proximate result of one or more of the forgoing wrongful act or omissions by ZIMMER, HADDOCK was caused to suffer and sustain injuries of a permanent nature; to endure pain and suffering in body and mind; to expend money for medical care in the past and in the future; furthermore, HADDOCK was unable to and will in the future be unable to attend to her normal affairs and duties for an indefinite period of time.

COUNT V

(Loss Consortium against ZIMMER)

- 54. HADDOCKS incorporate by reference the above paragraphs.
- 55. HADDOCKS are legally married and were legally married at the time of the events described in this Complaint.
- As a result of the wrongful and negligent acts of the Defendants, and each of them,
 HADDOCKS were caused to suffer, and will continue to suffer in the future, loss of
 consortium, loss of society, affection, assistance, and conjugal fellowship, all to the
 detriment of their martial relationship.
- 57. The injuries and damages to SHELLY HADDOCK were caused solely by the wrongful and negligent acts of ZIMMER.
- 58. As a direct and proximate result of ZIMMER'S wrongful conduct, HADDOCKS sustained and will continue to sustain severe physical injuries, severe emotional distress, mental anguish, economic losses and other damages for which they are entitled to

compensatory and equitable damages and declaratory relief in an amount to be proven at trial.

WHEREFORE, HADDOCKS, pray for judgment against ZIMMER for compensatory damages, exemplary damages in a sum in excess of the jurisdictional limits of this Court, together with interests and costs of this action and any other damages this Court may deem just and proper.

DEMAND FOR A JURY TRIAL

HADDOCKS demand a trial by jury.

Dated: June 4, 2020

Respectfully submitted,

Ivan L. Land (P65879)

Law Offices of Ivan L. Land, P.C.

Ivan L. Lav

Attorney for Plaintiffs

25900 Greenfield Rd., Suite 210

Oak Park, MI 48237-1267

248.968.4545 / (f) 248.968.4540

ill4law@aol.com

